MBRAS
THE MALAYSIAN BRANCH OF
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Notes on Ancient Times in Malaya (Continued)
Author(s): Roland Braddell
Source: *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (147) (March 1949), pp. 1-24
Published by: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41560491
Accessed: 22/06/2014 18:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Notes on Ancient Times in Malaya*

(*Received, February 1948; revised, August 1948*)

by ROLAND BRADDELL, *M.A.* (*Oxon*:), *F.R.G.S.*

(*Continued from J.R.A.S.*(*M.B.*) *Vol. XX, Pt, 1, pp. 161-186; Pt. 2, pp. 1-19*).

4. Takola and Kataha.

In Book VII of his Geography Ptolemy gives the following four positions, as stated in Renou's edition (56), which is generally conceded to be best (272, p. 22, n. 3) :—

Beroba, town	162° 20′ E	6° N.
Promontory situated after this town	159° E	4° 20′ N.
In the Golden Chersonese: Takola, emporium	160° 30′ E	4° 15′ N.
Promontory situated after this town	158° 20′ E	2° 20′ N.

The first two of these positions are the last of those given "Amongst the cannibal Besyngitai in the Sabarakos Gulf".

In 1897 Dr. C. O. Blagden said that the Golden Chersonese is "without any doubt the Malay Peninsula" (62, p. 236) and that is the generally accepted identification. The data in Ptolemy's Geography make it certain, in our view, that his Golden Chersonese must have been the Malay Peninsula.

The usual view is that Ptolemy wrote his Geography *ca*: 150 A.D. and certainly during the period 150-160 A.D. It is clear from his Almagest that he took observations personally the earliest of which was in 127 A.D. and the latest in 141 A.D. The Tetrabiblos and then the Geography followed the Almagest and finally the Astronomical Hand-tables. Therefore, the Geography must have been written after 141 A.D.; and it seems to be clear that Ptolemy outlived the Emperor Antoninus Pius who died in 161 A.D.

As Ptolemy tells us himself, his Geography was based upon the work of Marinos of Tyre, which he corrected and completed from further information gathered by himself. Marinos, who is usually

* Unfortunately suitable type for setting some of the diacritical marks required by this paper is not available in Malaya. An attempt has been made to obtain the the necessary fonts from the manufacturers, but they have not been able to supply it in time. To avoid confusion, the paper has therefore been **set without any diacritical marks.**

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

dated as *ca*: 120 A.D., obtained his information from the book of a sea-captain or traveller named Alexander, who is usually ascribed to *ca*: 75 A.D. The works of Alexander and Marinos have been lost and are known only from quotations by Ptolemy.

The evidence of classical literature, therefore, shows that the history of Takola begins in the 2nd century A.D. and, since it was then of sufficient importance to be a Roman emporium, must go back at least to the 1st century A.D.

We take the Malay Peninsula as beginning at the isthmus of Kra in latitude 10° N. and that is the usual view; but many writers take it further north to 13° 45′ N. so as to include Tenasserim. For Ptolemy it began at the promontory which we identify with Junk Ceylon (Puket Island), following Berthelot (53). One piece of evidence was adduced in the *Introduction*[1] to show that Junk Ceylon once was not an island but an actual promontory, and to that more evidence could be added, so that this fact can be accepted. Whether or not it was still an actual promontory in the time of Ptolemy does not matter, since its general appearance is such. The Sabarakos Gulf is agreed generally to have been the present Gulf of Martaban and the area extending south of it. The last town given by Ptolemy in the Besyngitai country is Beroba. Using the general indications in Ptolemy, Berthelot places Beroba about two-thirds down the coast line and so where the present Karathuri appears on the map[2]; and this identification we accept. Below the Gulf of Martaban there is only one really prominent promontory and that is the one formed by Junk Ceylon.

To locate Ptolemy's Takola we must look for a place well to the east and also to the south, of Ptolemy's promontory. It is axiomatic with us that, while the exactitude of Ptolemy's positions cannot be accepted, and identification must accord with his general indications or otherwise the whole subject becomes mere guess-work; and we find the most satisfactory method of approach to be that of Berthelot, which has been explained already in the *Introduction*[3].

Since, therefore, Ptolemy's promontory can only be Junk Ceylon and since Takola was east and south of it, we must reject the identification with Takuapa, which has been accepted by so many, and we would ask what is the promontory, if Takola were Takuapa. We should also note that there is no real similarity between the names, although Takuapa is often, even generally, called Takopa. *Takuapa* means "tin in the forest", while *Takuatung* means "tin in the plain", *takua* being Siamese for "tin" (309, ii, pp: 16 and 17)[4]. In Ptolemy's time the Thai languages had not reached this area, according to general opinion.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

It would seem that in his identification of Takola with Takuapa Dr. Quaritch Wales was greatly influenced by the fact that it afforded the best anchorage for ships on the whole west coast of the Malay Peninsula and that it was the first point of land reached by east-bound vessels from India after leaving the Ten Degree Channel (288, pp: 36, 55). Of the excellence of its harbour there cannot be any doubt but what evidence is there that the ships used the Ten Degree Channel? Seen on a modern map, one can, as Dr. Quaritch Wales did, push one's finger from Negapatam through the Channel in a south-eastward direction until it rests upon Takuapa; but did the ancient sailors from Negapatam so push their ships? The only direct evidence which we have in translated form is that of I Ching (I Tsing) in the 7th century A.D. and it does not help because ships in those days sailed from the ancient port of Kedah, as will be seen later. Moreover, according to Ptolemy, ships for the Golden Chersonese sailed from the *apheterion*, a place somewhere in the Godavari-Kistna area, and it would seem, though it is far from certain, that they crossed to a place which Ptolemy calls Sada and from there sailed down the coast. Moreover, as Dr. Quaritch Wales says, it was necessary to escape "the clutches of the savage Andamaners". Both for that purpose and navigationally one would have supposed a passage between Car Nicobar and the Nicobar Islands. There is the further fact that water and wood were necessary at convenient places for the ancient ships and that the Nicobars were well situated for this purpose. Long direct passages in early times were avoided for a variety of reasons.

Takola as written by Ptolemy, is agreed universally to have been the same place as the sanskrit Takkola. Reference has already been made in the *Introduction*[5] to Sylvain Levi's celebrated geographical study (61) in which he considered a number of places, including Takkola, which appear in various works of ancient Indian literature and particularly in the *Niddesa*, usually dated as between the end of the 1st and beginning of the 3rd century A.D. (181, p. 58). The name of Takkola appears also in the pali *Milindapanha*, the date of which is uncertain but is placed in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*[6] as approximately about the beginning of the Christian era. Professor Nilakanta Sastri, however, considers it to be *ca*: 400 A.D. (57, pp: 623-624). In St. John's translation (60, p. 217) the passage reads:—

"Just, O King, as a ship-owner who has become wealthy by constantly levying freight in some seaport town, will be able to traverse the high sea, and go to Vanga or Takkola, or China, or Sovira, or Surat, or Alexandria, or the Coromandel coast, or Further India (Suvannabhumi) or any other place where ships do congregate".

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The description of Takkola as a place where ships congregated accords well with the word *emporion* which Ptolemy attaches to Takola; but it is only in Ptolemy that we get any data for its location. There are absolutely none in the Indian literature. We have discussed the identification of Takola in the *Introduction*[7]. Berthelot considered that Ptolemy's general indications showed that it must have been Trang and we pointed out that archaeologically Trang does not seem to have been sufficiently ancient. We suggested, accordingly, ancient Kedah; but that suggestion has been rejected by Dr. Quaritch Wales (268, p. 67) and by Professor Nilakanta Sastri (310, p. 9); so the question must be re-considered. The rejection turns upon the Chola inscriptions of the 11th century A.D., concerning which there is a large literature, and it involves consideration of the Tamil names *Kaḍaram*, *Ilangasoka* and *Talaittakolam* occuring therein. In the inscription there is no geographical indication where these places are but scholars have agreed identifications upon etymological reasoning. Nobody, however, has paused to consider the complete disappearance from Indian literature of the sanskrit *Takkola* for many centuries before the appearance of the tamil *Talaittakolam*.

In the *Introduction*[8] the identification of the Chinese toponyms Tun-sun (Tien-sun, Tun-hsun) and Tou-chu-li has been considered and the facts concerning them have been set out. It was submitted upon these facts that Tun-sun must have been a general name for the Malay Peninsula. Its principal place is not named in the Chinese records but the facts which they give show that it must have been on the west coast of the Peninsula and that it was a port, from which ships sailed to India, as well as a mart for east and west to which merchants came in great numbers to barter. It was, accordingly, an entrepot. The name Tun-sun dates back to the 3rd century A.D. and the notice in the *Liang Shu* says that there were five kings in Tun-sun, all of whom were vassals of Funan, though it is not possible to say exactly at what date. It appears from the *Liang Shu* that Tou-chu-li became known in China during the time of the Wu dynasty, 222-280 A.D. There are no geographical data concerning it except that clearly it must have been a port on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula in sea-communication with India. In the *Introduction* the resemblance of the name to that of Takola was noted and views upon that question were collected; and we posed the question "May it not be that Ptolemy's Takola, the principal town of Tun-sun and Tou-chu-li are one and the same?"

In his latest work Professor Coedes considers that Tun-sun was "probably on the Malay Peninsula" (272, p. 30 and p. 46, n.1) and he accepts without any reservation (ibid: p. 47) that T'eou-kiu-li (i.e. Tou-chu-li) is the same place as the sanskrit Takkola

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of the *Milindapanha*. It is also worthy of remark that in his *Kambuja-Desa*, 1944, Professor R. C. Majumdar accepts that Teu-ki-li, as he writes it, was "probably the famous port of Takkola". We feel justified, therefore, in putting forward the suggestion that the answer to the question which we posed should be in the affirmative.

Professor Nilakanta Sastri in 1940 (311, p. 287, n. 1) placed Takola "on the isthmus of Kra or a little to the south" but that will not fit the data in Ptolemy. In 1944 Professor Coedes (272, p. 47) wrote concerning the sanskrit Takkola that "it is agreed to place this town at Takua Pa on the west coast of the isthmus of Kra, but it may perhaps have been more to the south"; and for the latter part of that statement he cited the present writer's *Introduction*. For reasons already given, we suggest that Takuapa must be rejected and that we must look east and south of Junk Ceylon. If the lack of archaeological evidence can be ignored, Berthelot's identification with Trang is undoubtedly satisfactory and answers the data in Ptolemy. Warington Smyth (309, ii, p. 11) considered that the port of Tun-sun was "more than likely to have been near Trang". In the *Introduction*[9] we wrote with regard to Takola that "We would expect a surrounding hinterland of importance. We are not dealing with the south but the north of the peninsula. A harbour and the meeting of trade-routes is sufficient for a southern emporium served by both monsoons but not for the northern one"; and the facts of navigation and of the monsoons make that proposition clear. Trang satisfies these requirements. Rice is grown there (309, ii, p. 13) and easy land-routes connect it with Patalung province (272, p. 33), which is an agriculturally rich one (309, ii, p. 117) and with the big province of Nakon Sri Tammarat, or Lakon as it is more usually called (309, ii, v. 128). This latter province is also known as Ligor, which Graham says is "probably a Chinese corruption of Lakon" (312, i, p. 31): he tells us (ibid: p. 10) that "round about the towns of Lakon and Patalung the largest and most fertile plains are situated". Warrington Smyth says that in his time Trang could generally be used by small coasters and that vessels there did not need to face half the bad weather that they must when going to the other ports (309, ii, p. 128). He also says that according to public tradition native boats could ascend the eastern branch of the Bandon River to its source and then go down the Trang River to the west coast without a portage, the distance being given as 170 miles (ibid: p. 80). The Bandon River drains an extensive valley between two mountain ranges.

The reader will have noticed that Ptolemy puts Takola 5 minutes south of the promontory and 1 degree 30 minutes east of it (his degree being 50 geographical miles), and it may well be asked how that fits Trang. An examination of Berthelot (53)

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

should be made on this point but some further facts concerning Ptolemy's methods will also be helpful. As we have said, he corrected and completed the work of Marinos by means of further information which he collected himself from sailors, merchants and travellers in Alexandria. None of such information could have been really accurate. As Warmington says (33, p. 131), Ptolemy "was dependent for his information upon ignorant sailors, who often misspelt hopelessly the very names of the ports at which they touched. He had only their word for the directions in which they sailed from port to port, and this was often entirely wrong; and for distance, as he himself confesses, he had to be content with calculating from the average run of a ship per day, with deductions to allow for irregularities of the coast, and other disturbing factors". Seamanship in those days was pilotage rather than navigation and the ships themselves had unhandy steering and rigging which did not permit of their sailing close to the wind or tacking across it. They were dependent upon wind and tide, and the wind had to be a favouring one. To attribute to each day's sail by such ships, particularly in Malaysian waters, a fixed average must have led to errors. Throughout antiquity longitudes were matters of dead reckoning; there was no precise method of observing diurnal time or of comparing such observations with one another. Though there were instruments by which latitudes could be measured, it would seem that experienced travellers did not use them extensively and it is clear that Ptolemy had very few such observations, none of which could have been completely accurate. The gnomon and the astrolabe (fore-runner of the sextant) were known but experienced seamen did not rely upon them. They sailed from point to point, or, where they knew the favouring wind, put out boldly to sea trusting to arrive roughly at their destination.

Ptolemy assigned precise longitudinal and latitudinal positions and prepared his tables "by calculating and comparing itineraries, rendering days' journeys and voyages into stadia, and other such rough methods as have been employed by geographers in all ages when they have had to lay down maps of countries for which they had no proper scientific materials" (55, ii, p. 549). He thus gave scientific form to that which was quite unscientific. Moreover, the maps and MSS. of Ptolemy's Geography which remain to us all date many centuries later than the original work and there exists the margin of error caused by faulty copying or by deliberate changes. Accordingly, it is useless to attempt a purely mathematical approach to his longitudes and latitudes. The only method is to accept the general indications and to endeavour, as Berthelot does, to work back to the information received by Ptolemy, and then to check results, where possible, with archaeological and historical facts. It is for this reason that we suggest Berthelot's identification of Takola with Trang to be satisfactory.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Summarizing, then, we submit (1) that Ptolemy's Promontory was Junk Ceylon (2) that Takola = Takkola = the principal place of Tun-sun = Tou-chu-li and (3) is best fitted by Trang, save upon archaeological evidence. Since that evidence has been ignored in the identification with Takuapa, it can also be ignored in the case of Trang, for it must be remembered that archaeologically Takuapa cannot be taken back to Ptolemy's time, the potsherds discovered there by Dr. Quaritch Wales being of doubtful evidentiary value, to say the least.

We have suggested in the Introduction[10] that Tou-chu-li is not the same place as the Chu-li (which seems to be the correct rendering of Chu-chih) appearing in the *Nan chou i wu chih;* but, even if it is, the name seems to disappear after the 3rd century A.D., since Wan Chen, the author of that work, is stated by the *Sui Shu* to have lived in that century. Accordingly it would seem that just as Takkola disappears from ancient Indian literature and Takola from classical, so Tou-chi-li disappears from the Chinese records, any later mention being but repetition in the fashion of Chinese historians and encyclopaedists. As will be seen later, *Takkola* is preserved, however, in the name of a commodity for many centuries later.

We pass now to Kataha which Dr. Quaritch Wales (268) would locate in Perak and Mr. Moens (241) first in Java and later in Johore.

In the text of the famous Tamil poem *Pattinappalai*, of the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., we are told of "goods from *Kalagam*" which found their way to the ancient city of Puhar (Kaverippattinam). The full passage is translated by Professor Nilakanta Sastri in his history of the Cholas (57, pp: 99-100). The annotator of the poem, who wrote very much later, says that this *Kalagam* was the same as *Kadaram;* and Professor Nilakanta Sastri says that this has the sanction of old lexicons like the Pingalam (ibid: p. 264) and that the *Divakaram*, the earliest lexicon in the Trang language now known to us, gives the equation in its geographical section (313; p. 26). *Kadaram*, also written *Kidaram*, was the Tamil equivalent of the sanskrit *Kataha*, as we know from the Chola inscriptions. The views of Professor Nilakanta Sastri upon the series of names (and no higher authority could be cited on the point) are as follows:—

(1) "In the text of the *Pattinappalai*, the word *Kalagam* stands for the name of a place in constant trade relations with *Pattinam* or *Kaveripatnam*, the celebrated port of the early Chola monarchs of the Sangam age. And the mention of *Kalagam*, which must be *Kadaram* or nothing, in this early poem of the second or third century A.D. is not without considerable significance to a

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

study of the early history of the Hindu colonies of the East" (314, pp: 128-129):

(2) *"Kataha* is Sanskrit, and the three other words are Tamil; of these *Kadaram* and *Kidaram* are variants of the same word (cf: Kada-kida, kana-kina, pala-pila, etc.) which has the same meaning as *Kataha;* while *Kalagam* meaning 'black' is synonymous with *Kadara,* also Sanskrit, meaning 'tawny' or 'dark brown'. The form *Kalagam* is the earliest in Tamil literature. So that the Indian names of this kingdom fall into two groups:

Skt. *Kataha* = Tam. *Kadaram* or *Kidaram* = cauldron

Skt. *Kadara* = Tam. *Kalagam* = black, or dark brown.

"It is difficult to decide which of these is the earliest form of the name, and all of them seem to be purely Indian words, having little to do with any language in Indonesia" (ibid:, pp: 129-130).

Professor Nilkanta Sastri, therefore, is in accord with the views expressed by Professor Coedes in his famous study of Srivijaya in 1918 (315, pp: 19-20); and he rejects the criticism of those views by Ferrand (140).

Though the identity of Kalagam with Kadaram may, perhaps not be entirely free from doubt, there is general agreement with the rest of these views, and for our present purposes all are accepted.

Dr. V. S. Agrawala (316, p. 96) says that "Kataha Dvipa is mentioned several times in Sanskrit and Prakrit literature as a place situated beyond the sea and reached by ships leaving the sea-port of Tamralipti. In Prakrit its name occurs as Kadahadipa". Tamralipti is, of course, the modern Tamluk in the Midnapur district in the western part of the Ganges delta.

References to the Puranas were made in the *Introduction*[11], and to the nine divisions, Indra-dvipa, Kaseruman, Tamra-varna, Gabhastiman, Kumari-dvipa, Naga-dvipa, Saumya, Gandharva, Varuna. The Vamana Garuda Puranas substitute Kathaha in place of Saumya or Gandharva (317, p. 59) and the Agnipurana refers to a "peak, as the boundary of a tract, under the name of Anda-Kataha, of which the limit is said to be the peak in question" (318, p. 59, n. 13).

Dvipa, of course, means either "island" or "continent". Kataha Dvipa therefore, indicates generally a large tract of sea-girt land: and the *Kaumudimahotsava* mentions a city Kataha-nagara as one of the great Indian cities famous for gay life (318, pp: 61-63; 316, p. 59). Dr. Sircar (316, p. 59) thinks that this sanskrit

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

drama is not earlier than the 7th or 8th century A.D. Dr. O. C. Gangoly says that the upper limit of its date "has been accepted by scholars as the seventh century" (318, p. 61). He writes (ibid: p. 67) that "Reverting to the text of the *Kaumudi-mahotsava*, we have cited enough references to establish that Katahanagara as a very popular city was very well known to Indians who made frequent voyages to the city, which was thus linked up with India Proper in various ties of mercantile and social interest". He thinks (ibid: p. 64) that "It is very probable that Kataha (Kalagam, Kadaram) was an important sea-port and a brisk centre of trade, at least from the third century A.D., long before the rise of the Sailendras". He says (ibid: p. 65) that the principal port of embarkation for Kataha was Tamralipti and that various passages in the *Kathasaritsagara* leave no doubt that frequent voyages were made.

The Katha literature of the 8th to 11th centuries A.D. shows Kataha Dvipa as a popular place in stories concerning the adventures of merchants overseas (316), and one finds some slender geographical clues for its location in the Kathasaritsagara, or Ocean of Story, for which we use the superb edition by Mr. N. M. Penzer (173). These clues are as follows:

(1) the story of Guhasena shows that the city of Tamralipta (as Mr. Penzer has it) was in sea communication with "the country of Kataha" (173, i. pp: 153-156);

(2) in the story of Chandrasvamin we are told that he went in a ship from Jalapura, an Indian coastal city, to the "great island of Nārikela" and then to the island of Kataha with the merchant Danavarman; and there he heard that another merchant named Kanakavarman "had gone from that island to an island named Karpura. In the same way he visited in turn the islands of Karpura, Suvarna and Simhala with merchants, but he did not find the merchant whom he was in search of. But from the people of Simhala he heard that that merchant Kanakavarman had gone to his own city, named Chitrakuta" (173, iv, pp: 223-224);

(3) in the story of the Two Princesses we are told that King Gunasagara, who was a King in "the dvīpa named Kataha, the home of all felicities", decided that his daughter should marry King Vikramaditya; "Accordingly, the King made his daughter embark in a ship on the sea, with her retinue and wealth, and sent her off. But it so happened that when the ship came near Suvarnadvipa it was swallowed, with the princess and the people on board, by a large fish" (173, ix, pp: 50-51).

Some further facts as to Takkola and Kataha can be obtained from the names of certain products. As to the former the reader

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

should note Sylvain Levi (61) and Coedes (315, p. 15). Professor Nilakanta Sastri adduces further evidence to which attention is now drawn.

In India to this day, and particularly in South India, the Malaysian area is known as *dvipantara* (319, p. 1) and the antiquity of this name has been shown by Sylvain Levi (320), who shows that it corresponded exactly with the Chinese use of K'un-lun and accordingly covered the "South Sea", or Malaysia. Professor Nilakanta Sastri refers to two other passages, one in Sanskrit and the other in Tamil, in which the word *dvipantara* occurs (319, pp: 3-4). In the former there occurs the phrase *"dvipantara-nita-lavanga"*; and a connection between the *dvipantara* and *lavanga* (sanskrit for "cloves") is shown in the full passage. Unfortunately, however, the learned Professor has fallen into the error of thinking that "the home of the cloves, *lavanga*, is the Malay Peninsula". Despite many attempts in early British times, cloves could never be grown successfully in the peninsula. This, however, is immaterial and all we need do is to substitute "Malaysia" for "Malay Peninsula" and remember that, as far back and as late forward as we can trace, the entrepots of the Peninsula have been great centres of the clove and spice trade. The Moluccas are, of course, the true home of the clove.

The Sanskrit passage cited by the Professor occurs in the *Raghuvamsa* of Kalidasa, who is generally taken to have lived at the end of the 4th century, or in the 5th century, A.D., though additions were made later to his work.

The Tamil passage occurs in the ancient poem *Silappadikaram* and is rendered by the Professor (313, p. 26) thus, "Having entered together with the east wind that came laden with (the aroma) of aloe, silks, sandal, spices and camphor put by the residents of Tondi on board a fleet of tall roomy ships". The place which was entered was the city of Madura in the south of India. Professor Nilakanta Sastri thinks that the Tondi here could not have been either the celebrated one of the Cheras on the south-west coast of India or the one in the Ramnad District of south India but must, from the context, have been a Tondi somewhere in lands colonised by Indians across the sea and probably Malaysian. The commodities are just such as would have come from a Malaysian entrepot, their arrival on the east wind means that they had come from such a direction, and one knows that the ancient Indians carried names from their home-lands to their new colonies. One need have no hesitation, therefore, in accepting the Professor's suggestion.

He refers also to two commentators upon the poem, one an early one and the other of about the 14th century A.D. From them we learn that amongst the spices (*vasam*) was lavangam, Tamil

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

for "cloves", and *takkolam*, Tamil for "cubeb", while the later commentator mentions three varieties of aloe, *agil*, of which two are called respectively *takkoli* and *Kidaravan*. Obviously these names derive from Takkolam, or sanskrit Takkola, and Kidaram (Kadaram, Kataha). The Silappadikaram, in the view of Professor Nilakanta Sastri, is not an early work like the Pattinappalai and the passage relating to Tondi is later than the *Raghuvamsa* "by about a century, if not more" (313, p. 28).

Did the commodities take their names from the places or *vice versa?* We suggest the former as the true answer. Takkolam[12] is still to-day the name of an ancient and historic place, though nowadays it is a simple village situated directly to the west of Madras, six miles south-east of Arkonam junction (61, p. 14). The name Kadaram is known in Madura and it was there that Hultzsch in 1891 placed the Kadaram of the Chola inscriptions (315, p. 5). Certain exports of Malaysia were once known in England as "Straits produce", though none of them was grown there: they were trans-shipped at Straits Settlements ports. In our view, Takkola and Kataha were beyond doubt entrepots and the practice of attaching to commodities the name of the principal place from which they were shipped is an old and well attested practice, followed by the ancient Chinese, e.g. their use of *Po-ssi*, Persian. We suggest, therefore, that the names of two ancient places in India were given to two Indian overseas entrepots and that the names of the latter were later attached to distinctive commodities exported from them.

We have now given such facts concerning Kataha as appear in the ancient Indian literature available to us. Standing alone, they do not enable us to locate the place precisely; but the following conclusions can be drawn:—

(1) Kataha was the name of a large tract of sea-girt land, *Kataha Dvipa*, or in parkrit *Kadahadipa*, in which there was a famous city *Katahanagara*, which was also an entrepot in constant sea-communication with India;

(2) In Kataha there was an important peak which formed the boundary of a tract called Anda-Kataha;

(3) Kataha was in the *dvipantara* i.e. Malaysia, and from it sea-routes led to and from Tamralipti in the Ganges delta, Narikela Dvipa, Karpura Dvipa, Suvarna Dvipa and Simhala Dvipa;

(4) from Kataha agil, or aloe-wood, was a celebrated export to India.

Beyond any question, Narikela Dvipa was the Nicobar Islands, Suvarna Dvipa was Sumatra, and Simhala Dvipa was Ceylon.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The location of Karpura Dvipa, which means "the Camphor Islands", is not certain; but in all probability it was either Borneo or the north-western part of Sumatra. Mr. N. M. Penzer (173, iv. p. 224, n. 1) quotes with approval a letter from Dr. C. O. Blagden to this effect; and Professor R. C. Majumdar has adopted this identification (181, p. 52). One finds it continually stated that the camphor from Barus, in NW Sumatra, was the finest but, in point of fact, this was the Arab view expressed from the 9th century A.D. onwards. The Chinese have always considered the Bornean camphor to be the best and have paid the highest prices for it. To them at any rate Borneo would have been *the* camphor island but what the Indians thought one does not know. Since Suvarna Dvipa in the *Kathasaritsagara* was clearly Sumatra, one prefers to allot to Karpura Dvipa the position of Borneo rather than to divide Sumatra into two *dvipa*, though the latter would be consistent with ancient practice. The objection to Borneo would be that the search of Chandrasvamin would take him very far, whereas, if he went to Ceylon, to NW Sumatra and to some other part of Sumatra, he would be travelling to places in the Kataha circle. Against that, however, is the fact that the shipwreck of Vikramaditya's daughter occurred near Suvarna Dvipa on her way to Kataha. There Suvarna Dvipa must be the north of Sumatra. Accordingly, we suggest that it is better to look outside Sumatra for Karpura Dvipa, and Borneo, being a notable camphor island fits well.

Kataha is usually identified with "Kedah" (e.g. 272, p. 181), and we may have here the true origin of the latter name. Mr. Penzer (173, i, p. 155) quotes Mr. R. Sewell, a high authority, as follows:—

"Granted that Kedah was so spelt in ancient times, and that it came to be called Kadaram in South India, we can delete the "m" as a South Indian dialect suffix (e.g. *pattana* becomes *pattanam*, *mandala* is *mandalam*, etc.). Then the transformation is natural enough:

Ke	da	h	
Ka	tā	ha	
Ka or Ki	dā	ra	m "

Mr. Sewell considered that the phonetic change from *ha* to *ra* is not too forced.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Mr. Penzer adds "It should be noted that the Southern Hindus knew of a Kadaram in their own country, and it is natural for people, hearing of a foreign place with a name like that of one of their own towns, to call the foreign place after their own". However, the prakrit *Kadaha* gives the same sound as the tamil *Kadaram* and the Chola inscription to which we refer late gives both sanskrit *Kataha* and tamil *Kadaram*. We suggest that the Indians took the name with them.

Sewell and Aiyangar (51, p. 65) say "Kadaram is almost certainly a South-Indian perversion of the name Kedah, a state on the west of the Malay Peninsula". The sanskrit Kataha, of which Kadaram was the tamil equivalent, gives us, however, a much closer approximation, and one may well query the derivation of the name Kedah, which Wilkinson gives in his Dictionary, from the Indian *Kheddah*, "elephant trap", or the arabic *Kadah*, "goblet". This question will be pursued further in the next section of these *Notes*.

Though it should be accepted in general that "Kedah" was Kataha or better Kataha Dvipa, and that Chieh-cha was the 7th century Chinese name for its principal port, this does not take us very far. We do not know the exact boundaries either of Kataha or of ancient Kedah. In 1894 Dennys[13] wrote "Kedah (formerly written "Queda", the Portuguese spelling), called *Sai* by the Siamese, to whom it is nominally tributary, is a State, bounded, on the north by Ligor (part of Siam), on the east by Patani, on the south by Perak, and on the west by the sea and the strip of land called Province Wellesley. It lies between 5° 30′ and 7° 4′ N. lat., is about 130 miles long by 30 to 40 miles broad". The State was then divided into three province—Setul, Perlis, and Kedah proper. The first-named was the most northerly and Perlis in the centre has since become a separate State under its own Rajah. Province Wellesley is a strip of land, originally part of the State of Kedah but ceded to the British in 1798.

In 1839 Newbold (69, ii, p. 2) wrote that Kedah extended "from the Trang river 7° 20′ N to the Krian, in 5° 10′ N., which separates it from Perak". The recent publication of the *Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires* enables one to give the extent of Kedah in the 16th century as "almost bounded on one side by Trang (Terrao) and on the other by the end of the kingdom of Malacca and Bruas (Baruas)". The mouth of the Bruas lies in 4° 28′ N.

The present Kedah River has its mouth in 6° 06′ N. but the Old Kedah (about 26 miles away) lay at the entrance of the Sungei Merbok in 5° 41′ N (321, p. 14) and Mr. Mills quotes Mr. Best, of the Malayan Survey Department, as saying that "The present Kedah River, owing to the geological formation, can never

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

have been much different from what it is now—a shallow-mouthed estuary within which a vessel drawing more than 6-8 feet would possibly be "neaped" for periods up to a fortnight by poor tides: the roadstead is hopelessly exposed to the S.W. monsoon. On the other hand, Kuala Merbok gives every indication of having always been a deep entrance, and it is still connected by a deep navigable channel with the Muda River, which in the old days undoubtedly carried nine tenths of Kedah's exportable produce. Knowing this area well, I am convinced that this channel, which runs through an extensive swamp, was once much larger than it is now and may possibly have been the main outlet of the Muda". The mouth of the Merbok lies in 5° 41′ N.

But in 1825 Milburne and Thornton[14] said that the Kedah River (Kuala Batrang) was navigable for vessels of 300 tons but that the entrance was choked by a mud-bank. All vessels which passed that bank went up to Alor Star. In 1839 Newbold 69, ii, p, 3) said "The embouchure of the Quedah river lying in 6° 6′ N., will admit, at spring tides, vessels of 250 tons".

For the geology of Kedah and Perlis the reader should refer to Willbourn (169) and for its prehistory to Collings (322; 323) and Callenfels (324), while there is a short note concerning the Trang-Patalung area by Evans (83, p. 161).

For the archaeology of Kedah in historic times we have Evans (83, pp: 105-121), Dr. Quaritch Wales (268), and Dr. and Mrs. Quaritch Wales (325).

It is certain that in Ptolemy's time the geography of the Malay Peninsula must have presented different features from those shown in a map to-day,[15] but on the material available at present it is quite impossible to state the differences. Willbourn (169, p. 290) says "Mr. Ridley[16] suggests on botanical evidence, that at no great distance of time the flat land of Kedah was under the sea, in which Gunong Jerai[17] and Gunong Perak stood out as islands as Penang does at the present day, and that the present flora of Province Wellesley and Gunong Jerai came up from the south while the flora of the country from Bangtaphan to Alor Star came from Burmah southwards". Mr. Ridley, doubtless, was referring to times long preceding the Christian era. Nowadays the plain on the side of Kedah Peak "extends into Perlis to within a few miles of the Siam border, and east of Alor Star a narrow deep bay of alluvium penetrates inland as far as Kampong Pinang. It is possible to draw a line from the sea eastwards through Alor Star, on perfectly flat country for more than half the breadth of the State at its widest part" (169, p. 296). "The greater part of Perlis is occupied by a flat alluvial plain which extends southwards through Kedah as far as Gunong Jerai" (ibid: p. 299). Dr.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Quaritch Wales (268, pp: 1-2) says that much of the flat land available in Kedah and Province Wellesley for padi culture is "of quite modern formation, especially that which lies north of Kedah Peak, and has been vastly increased within living memory. The importance of the so-called Kedah River, on which the modern capital Alor Star is situated, is of only very recent origin. It is formed only by the confluence in new low land of several small streams which in the early days of Indian colonization emptied themselves separately into the sea and offered neither safe anchorage nor suitable agricultural land on their banks". He places his "First Wave" of Indian colonization in Kedah as having occurred in the 1st to 3rd centuries A.D. Before one could accept the generalized statements in the passage just quoted from Dr. Quaritch Wales as representing the state of affairs in Ptolemy's time (which falls within the "First Wave") one would prefer to have detailed reports from the Survey Department or the Irrigation Department and would prefer much closer dating than "very recent origin". In point of fact, the earliest archaeological evidence of ancient Indians in Kedah dates from the second half of the 4th century A.D., two hundred years later than Ptolemy, and the dating is based upon epigraphic reasoning.

It is important to remember that Ptolemy mentions only two entrepots in the Golden Chersonese, Takola in the north and Sabana in the south, and that he makes no mention of Kataha or any name like it. The fair inference from this is that in his time Takola was the northern entrepot and that at some time later it became supplanted in importance by Kataha, just as in our own British times Malacca yielded in importance to Penang and Penang in its turn to Singapore. If we place Takola at Trang, as it seems that we must, we have seen what were its advantages and that it was situated conveniently to the Ganges delta and the Gulf of Siam: but a place in ancient Kedah would have had greater advantages which may have become apparent only after the settlement at Trang had been made. An entrepot on the Merbok River at the foot of Kedah Peak, in addition to having local food supplies, would have been in a good situation for navigation not only to and from the Ganges delta, as well as from Ceylon and Negapatam. The dating of Indian works is too vexed a subject to enable one to use them as the basis for positive evidence of the founding of Kataha, and the negative evidence of Ptolemy should prevail that in the 2nd century A.D. Kataha did not exist or, if it did, was then of no importance. Dr. Quaritch Wales says (268, p. 1) "Kedah combined the practical advantage of an excellent anchorage (the estuary of the Merbok) with the spiritual attraction of being dominated by a high mountain (Kedah Peak), which to the superstitious Indian sailors must have appeared to be a veritable home of the gods. From Kedah there was of course always easy access to the Ligor region of the

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

east coast, by the route now followed by the railway; but this route, as a means of avoiding the sea journey round the Peninsula, could never have competed with the much shorter route from Takuapa, further to the north, across to the Bay of Bandon. It is rather then as affording a good harbour at the northwest entrance to the Straits that Kedah drew its importance". Save for the identification of Takola with Takuapa we are in accord with Dr. Quaritch Wales in this passage. States and capitals had the same names very often and we identify Katahanagara (Kataha) with the settlement on the Sungei Bujang, which flowed into the Merbok estuary (268, p. 3); and the peak, which was the boundary of Anda-Kataha, we identify with Kedah Peak.

If we accept Trang as Takola, then the promontory which Ptolemy gives after it becomes Kedah Peak and not, as Berthelot has suggested, Penang. He made the mistake of thinking that Kedah Peak could not be described as a promontory; but we differ. It stands out in solitary grandeur and is a landmark for sailors visible 30 miles distant and we agree with Dr. Quaritch Wales (268, p. 2) that it was probably a peninsula at the material date.

We do not agree with Dr. Quaritch Wales in placing the city of Kataha inland in Perak. The evidence cited shows that the town of Kataha (or Katahanagara) was also a port. On the other hand, we do agree with Dr. Quaritch Wales that there must have been an important Indian settlement, or more than one, in the Kinta valley, Perak. In his criticism of the views of Dr. Quaritch Wales, Professor Nilakanta Sastri (310) has not appreciated either the effects of the NE monsoon upon the east coast of the Peninsula or, in particular, the results of mining. The actions caused by mining and the accumulation of silt and slag are too well known to us here from cases within our memory and the possibility of the disappearance of a city as the result of mining is something which has been proved by actual experience within the past forty years, e.g. Kuala Kubu and Serendah.

To summarize so far, it is submitted that (1) Kataha and Kadaram (variant Kidaram) were certainly the same place (2) Kataha was ancient Kedah (3) Ptolemy's Takola and the sanskrit Takkola were certainly the same place, which also was represented probably by the chinese Tou-chu-li (3) Takola is more likely to have been Trang than Takuapa.

5. Ilangasoka and Kadaram.

The Malaysian conquests of the Chola king Rajendra I are considered to have taken place in 1025 A.D. In the *Introduction*[18] we criticized the statement that these conquests are reflected in in the Malay Annals by Raja Suran's campaign in the Peninsula

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

and that Raja Suran was Rajendra I. We suggested that the name Suran stood for a King of the solar race.[19] Dr. Quaritch Wales (268, p. 78) consider that "Suran is clearly a reference to the fact that the Colas belonged to a dynasty claiming solar origin"; and he considers that the legends concerning Suran's conquests "do refer to the Cola invasions"; but he thinks that there is a mixture of Rajendra's two campaigns, the first against the Ganges area and the second against Kadaram. He takes Raja Chulan probably to be a corruption of the name of the Sailendra emperor Culamanivarman known to be reigning at the beginning of the 11th century A.D. Professor Nilakanta Sastri considers that our suggestion that Suran stood for a king of the solar race (*suryavamsa*) is "probable" (310, p. 15) and that we raised "many valid objections to Raja Suran's exploits being connected with Rajendra's expedition" (ibid:, p. 14, n. 7). He does not think that Raja Chulan stood for Culamanivarman because that suggestion seems "to overlook the fact that Culamanivarman never came into conflict with the Cola power, but lived on most friendly terms with it" (ibid: p. 15). Recently, Sir Richard Winstedt, basing himself upon identifications by Dr. L. D. Barnett, suggests that "Shulan must be the dynastic name of the Cholas of Negapatam" and that "Raja Suran could be Rajesuran, the Tamil form of Rajesvara or else the legendary Raja Sura of Tirukkalukkunram in Chingleput. His three "sons", Jiran of Chandragiri, Chulan of Vijaya-nagara, and Pandyan of Negapatam, must be corruptions of the names of the Chera, Chola, and Pandya dynasties, though the Cheras never ruled Chandragiri, the Cholas were nearly extinct before Vijayanagara arose and the Pandya kingdom never include Tanjore, in which Negapatam lies" (326, p. 129). One can only hope that scholars in India will turn their attention to the names and the legends in the Malay Annals.

We pass now to the Chola inscriptions upon which there is a large literature. It will be sufficient here to refer the reader to the discussions by the French scholars, Professor Coedès (315: 272 and Gabriel Ferrand (140), and by the Indian scholars, Professors R. C. Majumdar (181, pp. 167-182) and Professor Nikankanta Sastri (57, pp: 224, 258-268, 332-333, 622-624; 311, pp: 280-291).

In the sanskrit portion of the Larger Leyden Grant of Rajaraja Chola the Great, which may be dated 1005 or 1006 A.D., we learn of a Lord of *Sri-Visaya* "who was conducting the rule of Kataha". In the tamil portion he is called *Kidarattaraiyan*, or ruler of Kidaram.

Then there is a series of inscriptions concerning the conquests overseas of Rajendra Chola I, the first of which is dated in the 6th year of his reign and the last in the 31st year. There are

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

differences of opinion as to the exact dates of the regnal years of this king, but Professor Nilakanta Sastri puts them at 1012-1044 A.D. The inscriptions will be found summarized in Sewell and Aiyangar's *Historical Inscriptions of South India* (51, pp: 58 ff:). From them we find that the sanskrit Kataha and the tamil Kadaram are names for one and the same place.

Most important for our present purposes is a passage which occurs in the *prasasti* of the tamil portion of the Tanjore inscription of 1030 A.D. It has been translated several times by different scholars and we give the latest rendering by Professor Nilankanta Sastri, the distinguished Tamil scholar and historian (311, p. 286), setting the places out in capitals:—

"(Rajendra) having despatched many ships in the midst of the rolling sea and having caught Sangrama-Vijayottungavarman, the King of Kadaram, together with the elephants in his glorious army, (took) the large heap of treasures, which (that king) had rightfully accumulated; (captured) with noise the (arch called) Vidhyadhara-torana at the war-gate of his extensive capital (nagar), SRI-VIJAYA with the jewelled wicket-gate adorned with great splendour and the gate of large jewels; PANNAI with water in its bathing ghats; the ancient MALAIYUR with the strong mountain for its rampart, MAYURI-DINGAM, surrounded by the deep sea (as) by a moat; ILANGASOKA undaunted (in) fierce battles; MAPPAPPALAM having abundant (deep) water as defence; MEVILIMBANGAN guarded by beautiful walls; VALAIPPANDURU possessed of Vilaippanduru (?); TALAITTAKKOLAM praised by great men (versed in) the sciences; the great TAMRALINGA (capable of) strong action in dangerous battles; ILAMURIDESAM, whose fierce strength rose in war; the great NAKKAVARAM, in whose extensive gardens, honey was collecting; and KADARAM of fierce strength, which was protected by the deep sea".

In his previous translation of this passage (57, pp: 254-255) he added to Ilangasoka the words "i.e. Lankasoka", and for "the great Tamralinga" he gave "Madamalingam", the form also used by Professor Coedès.

It should be noted also that Jayangondar, the Court poet of the Chola king Kulottunga I, who wrote the tamil war-poem *Kalingattuppurani*, speaks of the Chola conquest of "Kadaram where the the crystal waves washed the sand mixed with red gold" (315, p. 20; 57, pp: 263-264).

The Tanjore inscription does not give geographical data upon which any identification of the places named could be ventured and

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

phonetic reasoning, combined with historical facts, has had to be followed. When the identification of Ptolemy's Takola was considered in the *Introduction*[20], it was suggested that it should be looked for in ancient Kedah and that the promontory which succeeded it would then be "the bulge of land between the Perak and Bernam Rivers, or Pangkor north of it". This suggestion was rejected by Dr. Quaritch Wales (268, p. 67) because in his views the bulge probably did not exist in Ptolemy's time, and because "secondly, there seems little doubt that Takola survived in the XIth century as the Talaittakkolam of the Cola inscription of 1030 A.D. But since the Ilangasogam of the same inscription has definitely been identified with the Langkasuka which the *Kedah Annals* so clearly locate at the base of Kedah Peak it is necessary to look for Talaittakkolam elsewhere".

Again he writes (ibid: p. 71) "we know for certain that in the XIth century Ilangasogam (= Langkasuka, the city on the Sungai Bujang, Kedah) was a dependent of the S'ailendra Empire". At pp: 76-77, he points out that Kadaram must have been different from Ilangasogam and says "Coedès himself felt this difficulty since he had already located the Langkasuka of the *Kedah Annals* (= Ilangasogam of the Cola records = Ling-ya-sseu-kia of Chau Ju-Kua) at the base of Kedah Peak, with which localization I cordially agree". And, at p. 68, he writes of "the powerful kingdom of Lang-ya-hsiu which is generally agreed to have been situated at Ligor".

Throughout his recent paper concerning the name Langkasuka in this Journal (vol: XXI, Pt: I, pp: 119-124) Dr. Linehan has assumed that it represented the Kedah settlement.

We agree completely that the Ilangasoka (Ilangasogam) of the inscription must be the Malay Langkasuka but we do not agree that it was the city at the foot of Kedah Peak on the Sungai Bujang. The evidence, as we shall show, places it on the east coast of the Peninsula.

In his latest work (272, pp: 182-183) Professor Coedès gives the following identifications of the places mentioned in the Tanjore inscription of 1030 A.D. as having been conquered by Rajendra I; and we give them as written by him:—

Crivijaya (Palembang),

Malaiyur (the Malayu of the 7th century, i.e. Jambi),

Mayirudingan (the Je-lo-ting of the Chinese, some place on the Malay Peninsula),

Ilangacogam (Lankasuka),

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Mappappalam, (Pappha,al placed by the singhalese chronicle *Mahavamsa* on the coast of Pegu),

Mevilimbangan (identified with Karmaranga or Kamalanka on the isthmus of Ligor),

Valaippanduru (perhaps Pandur (anga), in Champa, preceded either by the Tamil word *valai* "fortress", or by the Cham word *palei* "village"),

Talaittakkolam (Takkola of Ptolemy and the *Milindapanha*, on the isthmus of Kra),

Madamalingam (Tambralinga, Chinese Tan-ma-ling, of which the centre was at Ligor),

Ilamuridecam (Lamuri of the Arabs, Lambri of Marco Polo at the northern extremity of Sumatra),

Manakkavaram (Nicobar Islands),

Kadaram (Kedah).

As Professor Nilakanta Sastri says (311, p. 286) "it is not easy to explain the order in which the different places are named; this does not seem to follow with any accuracy the actual course of the campaign, but is apparently determined by the requirements of verse"; but (ibid: p. 287) "we may assume with Krom: "first an attack on the capital Sri Vijaya in which the king was taken prisoner, followed by the occupation of two important points of the East Coast of Sumatra; then the conquest of the Malay Peninsula, and finally Atjeh (Lamri) and the Nicobars on the way home; and all this summed up in the fall of Kataha"."

In connection with the names it should be noted that the Tamil *ma* is the same sanskrit *maha*, each meaning "great" and that the Tamil *talai* in Talaittakkolam means "head" or "chief". Sylvain Levi (40, p. 43), as quoted by Majumdar (181, p. 75), considered that the *me* in Mevilimbangan should "be analysed, in the inscription of Tanjore, like Ma-Damalingam, Ma-Nakkavaram, as Me-Vilimbangan; it is clear that Velimbangan is the Indian transcription of Malay *belimbing* which is the equivalent of Karmaranga. The Indian name of fruit, derived from the country, has become in its turn the indication of the country itself". Professor Coedès cites this passage from Sylvain Levi's *Pre-aryen et pre-dravidien dan l' Inde* (40) as the authority for his identification of Mevilimbangan.

Professor Nilakanta Sastri, as has been seen, writes Tamralinga in place of Madamalingam; and all are agreed that the

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

two places are the same. One prefers respectfully his view Valaippanduru defines satisfactory identification (311, p. 287).

We propose now to consider the identification of Ilangasoka (Ilangacogam) and Kadaram, which obviously from the context of of the inscription were two different places. We do not propose to weary the reader with a recapitulation of all the views which have been expressed about the location of these places. They exhibit in details a considerable conflict of opinion and many of them are out of date. We shall consider the matter afresh, giving such references as seem to be helpful.

There cannot be any doubt that the Tamil *Ilangasoka* is the same name as the Malay *Langkasuka* and the Javanese *Lengkasuka* of the *Nagarakretagama* of 1365 A.D.; but we do not agree with Dr. Quaritch Wales that the Ilangasogam of the Tanjore inscription "has definitely been identified with the Langkasuka which the *Kedah Annals* so clearly locate at the base of Kedah Peak" (268, p. 67). His authority for this identification was the famous study of Srivijaya in 1918 by Professor Coedès (315, p. 15), who based himself at that time on Gerini (327), Blagden (328), and Colonel Low's translation of the Kedah Annals, *Hikayat Marong Mahawangsa*. When this last was considered in the *Introduction*[21] we accepted the 1918 identification by Professor Coedès and related the Chinese Langga-siu (as we wrote it then) of the *Liang Shu* with the Lankasuka of Low's translation; but a further and closer analysis of the available facts causes us how to reject it, and, as will be seen later, Professor Coedès himself does not seem to hold the opinion any longer.

In 1906 Blagden wrote "But it is worth mention that Langkasuka still lies in the memory of the local Malays. It has developed into a myth, being evidently the 'spirit-land' referred to as Lakan Suka ('Lakaun Suka') by the peasantry of the Patani states and the realm of Alang-ka-suka, interpreted by a curious folk etymology as the 'country of what you will', a sort of fairy-land where the Kedah Malays locate the fairy princess Sadong, who rules over the Little People and the wild goats of the lime-stone hills, and persistently refuses all suitors, be they never so high-born or otherwise eligible" (328 p. 119). In 1905 Col: Gerini had identified the Lengkasuka of the *Nagarakretagama* as the old capital of Kedah mentioned in the Kedah Annals (327, pp: 495-498) and in 1909 he repeated this in his study of Ptolemy (46, p. 825). In 1909 in his *Notes on Malay History* (III) Blagden accepted this identification by Gerini and he set out the passage in the second strophe of Canto 14 of the *Nagarakretagama* where the dependencies of Majapahit in the Malay Peninsula are given. He also considered the identification of these dependencies; and

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the reader will find in Ferrand's *Textes* (172, i i,pp: 651-665) a list of all the names in the Javanese poem with many identifications. In his identification of Lengkasuka Blagden rested himself upon the Kedah Annals (328, pp: 148-149): but in addition to this name the poem gives *Keda* and *Jera*. The former was regarded by Blagden as obviously Kedah and Ferrand agrees. Of Jera Blagden said that, while the Dutch *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indie* identified it with Jering in the Patani states, it might equally well stand for Gunong Jerai (Kedah Peak) except that that district was already referred to by the mention of Lengkasuka.

The Kedah Annals, as Sir Richard Winstedt says, are "full of omissions, anachronisms and errors" and the text would not seem to have been completed till late in the 18th or early in the 19th century (329, pp: 32, 33). They are, therefore, clearly a case of a late annalist giving written form to current legends and oral history. As a source of interest the traditional matter is well worth exploration but the work cannot be treated as authentic history. In 1932 in his great Dictionary the late Mr. R. J. Wilkinson wrote that Langkasuka was "Probably in North Malaya. (where there is a River Langkasuka, where the Kedah records speak of L. still as an old Kedah capital, and where there are traditions of a fairy land (alang-ka-suka) or kingdom of a Golden Age)" Winstedt (92, p. 21) says that the Langkasuka River is "a tributary to an upper reach of the Perak River".

It is, then, clear that the legend of Langkasuka is not static in one place; the name represented a golden empire and a golden time of the past. That the Kedah annalist should have incorporated such a place in his work as the first name of the ancient settlement founded by Marong Mahawangsa was only natural, with the traditions of Langkasuka all around him on the tongues of the people; but these traditions were a general Malay heritage. The question before us is where Langkasuka must be placed exactly; and the facts of history show that (even if at one time or another its confines may have stretched to the west coast) it was primarily an east coast state, while Keda (Kedah) was always on the west coast and never reached the east.

(*To be continued*).

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Citations.

(309) SMYTH, H. WARINGTON. Five Years in Siam, 2 vols:, 1898.

(310) NILAKANTA SASTRI, K.A. Recent Progress in Malayan Archaeology, J.G.I.S., 1941, vol: VIII, pp: 1-16.

(311) NILAKANTA SASTRI, K.A. Sri Vijaya, B.E.F.E.O., 1940, vol: XL, no: 2, pp: 239-310.

(312) GRAHAM, H. A. Siam, 2 vols:, 1924.

(313) NILAKANTA SASTRI, K. A. The Tamil Land and the Eastern Colonies, J.G.I.S., 1944, vol: XL, pp: 26-28.

(314) NILAKANTA SASTRI, K. A. Kataha, J.G.I.S., 1938, vol: V, pp: 128-146.

(315) COEDES, G. Le Royaume de Crivijaya, B.E.F.E.O., 1918, vol: XVIII, No: 6, pp: 1-36.

(316) AGRAWALA, V. S. Some References to Kataha Dvipa in Ancient Indian Literature, J.G.I.S., 1944, vol: XI, pp: 96-97.

(317) SIRCAR, D. C. Katahanagara in the Kaumudimahotsava, J.G.I.S., 1938, vol: V, pp: 59-60.

(318) GANGOLY, O. C. Relation between Indian and Indoneisan Culture, J.G.I.S., 1940, vol: VII, pp: 51-69.

(319) NILAKANTA SASTRI, K. A. Dipantara, J.G.I.S., 1942, vol: IX, pp: 1-4.

(320) LEVI, SYLVAIN. Kouen-louen et Dvipantara, Bijdragen, 1931, vol: 88, pp: 621-627.

(321) MILLS, J. V. Malaya in the Wu-pei-chih Charts, J.R.A.S. (M.B.), 1937, vol: XV, pt: 3, pp: 1-48 (corrigenda, vol: XVI, Pt: 1, p. 154).

(322) COLLINGS, H. D. Report of an Archaeological Excavation in Kedah, Malay Peninsula, B.R.M., Series A, 1936, No: 1, pp: 5-16.

(323) COLLINGS, H. D. An Exacavation at Bukit Chuping, Perlis, B.R.M., Series A, 1937, No: 2, pp: 95-119.

(324) CALLENFELS, P. V. van STEIN. An Excavation of Three Kitchen Middens at Guak Kepah, Province Wellesley, Straits Settlements, B.R.M., Series A, 1936, pp: 27-37.

(325) WALES, DOROTHY C. AND H. G. QUARITCH. Further Work on Indian Sites in Malaya, J.R.A.S. (M.B), 1947, vol: XX, Pt: 1, pp: 1-11.

(326) WINSTEDT, R. O. Kingship and Enthronement in Malaya, J.R.A.S. (M.B.), 1947, vol: XX, Pt: 1, pp: 128-139.

(327) GERINI, G. E. The Nagarakreiagama List of Countries on the Indo-Chinese Mainland, J.R.A.S., 1905, pp: 485-511.

(328) BLAGDEN, C. O. Siam and the Malay Peninsula, J.R.A.S. 1906, pp: 107-119.

(329) WINSTEDT, R. O. The Kedah Annals, J.R.A.S. (M.B.), 1938, vol: XVI, Pt: 2, pp: 31-35.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

References.

1 J.R.A.S (M.B.), vol: XIV, Pt: 3, p. 21 n.

2 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XIV, Pt: 3, pp: 20-21.

3 ibid:, pp: 12-22.

4 See also takua dam, ibid: p. 118, and the glossary in Crawford (84).

5 J.R.A.S. (M.B.) vol: XVII, Pt: 1, pp: 157-158.

6 Chicago edition, vol: 15, p. 238.

7 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XIV, Pt: 3, pp: 34-35, vol: XVII, Pt: 1; pp: 192-206.

8 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XVII, Pt: 1, pp: 192-206.

9 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XVII, Pt: 1, p. 205.

10 ibid:, pp: 203, 206.

11 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XV, Pt: 3, pp: 65-75.

12 In 949 A.D. it was the scene of the famous battle in which the Chola Crown Prince Rajaditya lost his life (57, pp: 157-158).

13 *Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya*, 1894.

14 *Oriental Commerce*, 1825.

15 See *Introduction*, J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XV, Pt: 3, pp: 94-95.

16 H. N. Ridley, F.R.S., most distinguished of Malaya's botanists.

17 Kedah Peak.

18 J.R.A.S. (M.B.), vol: XIV, Pt: 3, pp. 44-48.

19 Ibid: p. 44.

20 J.R.S. (M.B.), vol: XIV, Pt: 3, p. 35.

21 J.R.A.S. (M.B.) vol: XV, Pt: 3, pp: 64-103.

This content downloaded from 91.229.248.204 on Sun, 22 Jun 2014 18:42:08 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions